6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 829 648 solidarity capable of disturbing the balance of power in Europe. And even so, we have to give an objective definition of this solidarity—a task rendered difficult by the traditional prejudices, the historical misinterpretations which, in the minds of many Westerners, have falsified the laws and motives which govern the expansion of Slavism.

563 829 No need to go far afield to see the effects of this ignorance of Slavonic realities, even when it is not reinforced by a feeling of animosity. In witness, I will simply cite this passage from a speech pronounced in the Tribunal of the French Senate on May 4, 1933, by the Chairman of the Committee for the Budget on Foreign Affairs:—

> 'That is a point to be noted, *viz.*, the awakening of the Slavonic race. . . . The objection is raised that Rumania is not essentially Slavonic; agreed. But there is Poland, there are the Baltic States, and, farther off still, the wholly Slavonic U.S.S.R., which is, so to speak, the mother of all the Slavonic nations of Central and Eastern Europe'.[1]

These few sentences, from the mouth of an authoritative speaker, contain as many errors as there are words. Rumania is not Slavonic, either essentially or in appearance. Still less the Baltic States. Far from being entirely Slavonic, the Soviet Union is hardly more than fifty per cent so. As for considering it the original habitation of the Slavonic tribes of Central and Eastern Europe, to do this is to settle, with an enviable assurance, a problem whose solution the most eminent ethnologists are still seeking.

Such was, however, the idea current in our official circles, on the eve of this War, concerning one of the determining factors of European peace.

186* 829 • 208 Even so, the honourable Parliamentarian who pronounced these gross untruths before his colleagues of the Senate was not prompted by malevolence when he spoke of an awakening of the Slavonic nations. This was not always the case with our journalists and their supporters. It would be possible to compile an anthology of ill-disposed or apprehensive judgements on the Slavonic world, from the pens of French intellectuals, or of men responsible for pronouncements on foreign policy. Is it necessary

[1] *Journal Officiel* of May 5 (1933), p. 791, col. 1.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

to add that, from the last quarter of the nineteenth century up to the Sarajevo outrage, Slavonic problems were localised in the Balkans, and that this did not help to facilitate their understanding, nor to procure for them an impartial judgement?

European 'volcano,' or 'rheumatism,' 'nest of vipers'—day in, day out, metaphors such as these flowed from the pens of our propagandists and diplomats when they were reviewing Balkan politics, because they were not prepared to admit that the crises in which these politics involved Europe were simply the repercussions of rivalry and scheming among the Great Powers.

If we leave diplomatic and political circles and pass to the public at large, we find that the word 'Slav' aroused more distrust than curiosity. For some people, it smacked of Nihilism or of Revolution; for others (forgetting that more than a quarter of the Slavonic world is Catholic) it held a menace to the unity of the Church. Slav refugees had fought on all the barricades during the nineteenth century; their names figured largely in the police alien records. In short, this word 'Slavism' suggested a set of psychological characteristics, rather than a geographical or national reality, and these characteristics—or their interpretation—made up a picture which the average Frenchman did not find very reassuring for Latin civilisation.

Whereas the political world adopted the caricature of Slavism outlined by the diplomats of the Ballplatz, the intellectual world, in its turn, often fell under German influence when dealing with the problems of Slavonic life. There was, in France, especially after 1870, a brilliant school of Slavicisers, who had studied the question on the spot. But for a long time it was restricted to a small number of enthusiasts, who lacked a sufficiently numerous audience to popularise their teaching.

Moreover, the early history of this teaching was unfortunate. The first holder of the Chair 'of Slavonic Language and Literature' at the *Collège de France* was Poland's most celebrated poet, Adam Mickiewicz. He was denounced to the Senate as a 'Panslavist'—a vague, but serious offence. For the time being, a well-chosen plural was sufficient to remove this offence: the chair changed its title and became the 'Chair of Languages and Literatures of Slavonic Origin'. Later on, however, Mickiewicz, accused of exaggerated mysticism and eccentricity, was obliged to give up lecturing altogether. The fate

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

the Hegelian philosophical construction, whence came the German Ultranationalist ideal, and which was now, through Khomyakov and his school (Kirejevsky, Constantin and Ivan Aksakov, Youri Samarin), to give rise to a powerful anti-Germanist reaction.

Khomyakov's odes constitute what we might call the epigraph of Muscovite Slavophilia. They are a pathetic and prophetic appeal to Slav solidarity: 'Look Southwards over the vast steppes, and the distant West. . . . Numerous are they, in the Carpathians and in the chasm of the Balkans, numerous are our brethren, slaves of the Turk or of the German. . . . Warm them at the fire of your love, and the day will come when the eaglets, our brethren, bursting their bonds with their brazen beaks, will, in their turn, fly off, as eagles fly'. (*Ode to the Eagle*, 1832.) The *leitmotiv* of these odes is the divine mission of Russia, who is to raise up her brethren and snatch them from the oppressor's yoke. But this mission does not go beyond a moral hegemony. 'Be not proud', says the poet elsewhere, 'in your dealings with Belgrade, O Prague, capital of the Czech countries! Despise not the Bohemian sanctuary of Vychegrad, O Moscow of the gilded domes! Brothers in blood, let us all remember that we owe each other equal and fraternal affection'.

The Slavophile school, in its early days, had what we should now call a 'bad press'. The Westernists, who then controlled the critics and moulded opinion, represented Khomyakov's friends as Chauvinists and Obscurantists. People made fun of their faith in the native virtues of the *moujik*, their extravagances in the matter of dress, the *mourmolka*, the traditional bonnet which they had adopted with the Russian costume, and especially at their illusions as to the expansion-power of Russian culture at that time. Nothing is so dangerous as a metaphor cast into the whirlpool of international life. Pushkin had one day written this unfortunate line:—

> 'Will the Slavonic streams all come and lose themselves in the Russian Ocean?'

That was sufficient to lend credence to the idea that Russia considered herself to have a divine mission, that of liberating her racial brethren, and grouping them around her. When the Russians spoke of 'Slavophilia', the West persisted in understanding 'Panslavism'. Yet they were two very different things.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

elements who were resisting the spirit of the *Schutzvertrag* and following divergent paths.

We may therefore consider Slovakia as a State which, from that time onwards, realised all Hitler's hopes. Better still, it had anticipated them. 'The spirit of National Socialism comes from Hlinka', said President Tuka, 'its methods come from Hitler'. 'Slovakia', he said again, 'must be the vestibule of Paradise'. Racial laws were applied in Slovakia with the same rigour as in Germany, and the Government prided itself on administering 'the most anti-Semite country in the world'. Out of 89,000 Jews who lived there in 1939, there remained in January, 1944, according to official statistics, 20,000 (11,000 of whom had been baptised) and these, moreover, were destined to be eliminated, down to the last man. 'Slovakia was the first country to feel the beneficial effects of the great purification to establish a just world order'—this testimony from the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* speaks volumes as to the docility with which the Bratislava Government responded to Hitlerian control.

It is never difficult to attach a conception of the State—however fantastic it may be—to historical antecedents. Slovak propaganda discovered 'positive elements' which justified the Government's policy. Its organ, the *Slowakische Rundschau*,[1] recalled that the Slovak State in its first form, the Great Moravian Empire, founded by King Svatopluk, had collapsed because it had proved incapable of collaborating in peace with the Holy Empire.

It was more difficult to reconcile the Hitlerian ideology with the principles of Christianity to which the people were profoundly attached (Slovakia is the European country in which the clergy are most in evidence in political struggles). This difficulty did not deter either the priest, Tiso, or his Government, who enjoy the doubtful credit of having, despite the Encyclicals, combined the teachings of the Church with the Hitlerian creed. This was a favourite subject for official speeches. 'The victory of Germany will be the victory of Christian principles', declared Mach, the Minister of the Interior, in his message for Christmas, 1943.

[1] Of July 7, 1940.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

648 793 159

origin, was in charge of a little Massachusetts church, the Holy Rosary, in the diocese of Springfield. Was he first sounded, and then invited to Moscow, as he himself was to allege, or did he improvise a mission? The facility with which he moved about in Russia, at a time when travelling was subject to severe restrictions, argues in favour of the former hypothesis. He was absent from April 17 to May 11, 1944, the object of his journey being, according to him, 'to see what he could do for the Catholic Church in Poland, Ukraine, and White Russia'. On his return he declared that he had twice been received by Stalin, and had obtained from him assurances, both verbal and written, in favour of religious liberty on Soviet territory. 'Future events will prove', he said, 'that Marshal Stalin nourishes very friendly sentiments towards the Roman Catholic Church. He wants a really democratic, independent Poland, capable of defending herself against any fresh aggression. The religion of the Polish people will be that of our ancestors; he will not tolerate any change. All he asks in return is a Poland animated with fraternal feelings towards the U.S.S.R.'.

Four hours after Father Orlemanski's return home, his bishop imposed the penalties provided for cases of unauthorised absence; he was forbidden to say Mass. After an attempted protest to the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, he submitted and solemnly promised never again to meddle with matters outside his priestly functions, upon which the bishop raised the interdict pronounced against him.

648 793 159 208

But his journey nevertheless aroused tremendous interest. The Soviet Radio called it a 'great international event', and the press published Orlemanski's declarations in full. As there are very few Catholics in Russia proper, the assurances given by Stalin referred especially to the liberated territories of the Ukraine and of Eastern Poland. The Tass Agency, emphasising the reality of these assurances, accused (though in moderate terms) the Hierarchy of the United States of having, in this matter, adopted a not very favourable attitude towards the Soviets. Whilst the *Christian Science Monitor* expressed satisfaction at the Orlemanski mission, and did not doubt that the Vatican would take advantage of the conciliatory attitude of the Soviets, the *Chicago Sun* placed its trust in the Catholic clergy's common sense to reject 'the poisoned advice of the agitators',

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

seeking to encourage the Church in her traditional opposition to the Soviets. But the *Post Dispatch* regretted that the Kremlin should have chosen such an unimportant person as Orlemanski for such a demonstration. The *Louisville Courier* deplored the censure passed on this priest by his bishop; no doubt the latter tolerated disparagement of the Soviet Union, but not efforts to understand it.

The truth seems to be that Father Orlemanski's initiative, whether concerted with Moscow or not, aroused in Slavonic circles reactions calculated to handicap the Government and prejudice Roosevelt's electoral campaign. While the Slavonic Committee of America approved this initiative, the *émigré* Poles threatened to launch a campaign which would have brought Washington and Moscow into opposition. It happened that Orlemanski's superiors were of Irish origin—which, obviously, did not predispose them to regard his journey with a favourable eye. In any case, the episcopal decision and the priest's submission cut short any attempts at propaganda, thus rendering a very opportune service to the Government, but postponing or compromising the perspective of a possible easing of the situation, if not of a *rapprochement* between Poland and the Soviets, and between the Soviets and the Vatican.

In Latin America the headquarters of the permanent Slav Committee were at Montevideo, where, in April, 1943, three hundred and ninety-four Slav delegates assembled at a Congress which established the Union of Slav Nationals (they were estimated at two millions), to organise the struggle against pro-Hitlerian activities.

* * *

This sketch of the recovery of the Slavs in the Old World and the New brings out two features: the gravitation of all the Slavonic nations round the Muscovite colossus, and the repugnance of a sector of Polish opinion to this method of regrouping.

As was to be anticipated, German propaganda affected to see in this the execution of a plan tending to 'Bolshevise' Europe, and even America. Germany again launched her old commonplaces about the inferiority of the Slavs. A Radio-Paris broadcast (February 21, 1943) assured listeners 'that about one-quarter of the American population is composed of Slavonic elements, of

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

The English press greeted this news philosophically, emphasising the fact that recognition was subject to the promise of free elections as soon as Poland's material situation would allow.

Isolated protests were made; as, for example, that of William John Rose, Professor at the School of Slavonic Studies in London, who wrote to *The Spectator*:—

'The solution adopted is the very one which was rejected by our House of Commons—the co-option of a minority of Poles from London and from Poland to a majority of Lublin Poles, the latter occupying all the chief posts.

'Great Britain and the United States have recognised this Government without any precise information having been given regarding the elections and their nature, though they were the condition on which recognition was granted.

'The renouncing of the principles for which the Allies fought for six years is deplorable. Whatever may be its significance for Poland, it is humiliating for the Western democracies. Obviously, we have an excuse; we are busy with our own elections. Unfortunately, however, while we were inactive others were not. What has become of the anger shown by Mr. Eden and M. Stettinius when M. Molotov exploded the "bombshell" (to use the expression of nearly all the journalists) concerning the fate of the Polish politicians?'

In Washington Senator Vandenberg declared to Mr. Grew, interim Secretary of State, that the settlement of the Polish question was inadequate and unsatisfactory for millions of citizens, himself included. 'This settlement does not appear to give a clear assurance that the Polish people will be able to express themselves freely under this Government, which is imposed on them by the Big Three, within the limits of frontiers likewise fixed by these same powers'.

In Moscow, on the contrary, the solution of the Polish crisis was considered as a victory for the democracies and a guarantee of European peace. The Soviet Government hastened to regularise its relations with the new State. On July 9[1] it signed a commercial treaty with Warsaw, in order to 'develop and consolidate to the utmost the economic relations between the two countries, in a spirit of friendship and collaboration'.

1 [1945 -- Analyst]

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 668 in Europe and in America'. And in the Belgrade newspaper, *Politika*, M. Stankovich, President of the Serbian Assembly, showed still greater discretion: 'Only the enemies of democracy could see in this meeting of Slavonic countries a manifestation tending to the creation of a Slav bloc, or an attempt to separate East and West'.

Marshal Tito, supported by Marshal Tolbukhin, the Metropolitan of Kiev, Mgr. Nicolaï, and the President of the Yugoslav Assembly, Ivan Ribar, opened the Congress. 'The Slavs', he said, 'have a mission, but not a mission to create a bloc. Yet the time has come to decide that they shall never again be divided against one another'. A message from Stalin, on the same lines, was read. The *leit-motiv* of the speeches was the merit of the Slav peoples in the triumph of democracy, and their contribution to universal civilisation.

In short, the eloquence of the Congressists did not go beyond a speculative exchange of views; it avoided drawing too much attention to the agreement of views between the small nations and Moscow.

[175] Nearly a hundred years had elapsed since the Prague Congress of 1848. By a curious trick of fate, over both these demonstrations of Slav solidarity, at a hundred years' interval, Russia exercised unopposed control. Great as was the opposition between the ideas of the Slavophiles and those of the Congressists of 1946, both Assemblies, with the same pride, saw their work as a threat to reaction—Austro-German reaction in 1848 and Western reaction in 1946.

The Congress organised the strengthening of economic and cultural relations between the Slav States. It formed a permanent Liaison Committee to sit in Belgrade.

• [208] The press in the Slavonic countries gave enthusiastic reports of these assemblies. In general, newspapers in the other countries were very reserved in their comments. On December 17 the *Manchester Guardian* recalled the century-old vision of a Slovak poet, a vision of the Slavs united in a powerful body with Russia as the head, Poland the trunk, Bohemia the arms, Serbia the legs. 'The new Panslav movement has arisen out of a common struggle against the invader. If it fosters the community feeling on the human plane, it may do good. If it tries to establish itself in the political domain, it will fail, as in the past'.

62 Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

645 175 Communists, then rejoined the partisans in Bosnia and was elected President of the National Liberation Front.

637 175 The chief event of this period was the trial of General Draja Mihailovich, who had organised the earliest resistance to the invader, but was subsequently accused of collaboration with the Germans and the Italians. Arrested on the borders of Bosnia and Serbia, he was court-martialled on June 10, 1946, by the Military Tribunal of Belgrade, which condemned him to death on July 15. He was shot. Some American airmen had vainly asked to bear witness in his favour. The Belgrade Government had documents published establishing his 'treason'; they reveal undeniable complicity with the enemy in the lower ranks, and, especially, the implacable intention of eliminating the Communists from the Resistance; the role of Mihailovich himself is less clearly shown—which explains the emotion his condemnation aroused in England and in America.

[829] The *Daily Telegraph* thus expressed itself on this condemnation: 'The long perspective of history will enable the truth about the much-discussed figure of Mihailovich to be more clearly perceived. His contemporaries can do no more than think that, caught up in the whirlwind of events beyond his control, he was a victim of Fate'.

In the same connection the British statesman, Noel Baker, declared that the decision to suspend aid to Mihailovich during the war had been taken as the result of numerous denunciations from various sources, alleging that he was no longer adequately contributing to the war effort. 'Subsequently', he said, 'it became evident that certain of his lieutenants were actively collaborating with the Germans'.

793 687 175 657 No less sensational was the trial of the Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, Mgr. Aloysius Stepinac. This followed proceedings against numerous members of his clergy, notably that involving some Slovene priests, in December, 1945, at Ljubljana. The bishop of that town, Mgr. Rozman, a refugee in Italy, was condemned to eighteen years' imprisonment.

• [208] The action against the Croatian priests accused of collaboration was prepared in January, 1946, by a violent press and radio campaign, denouncing the Archbishop's relations with the *Oustachi* of Pavelich, by whom he had been decorated (in

6s Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

described it as a 'crime against European civilisation', and on October 1 it was brought up at the Security Council by the French delegate, Parodi, during a discussion on Bulgaria's candidature for the United Nations. 648 696 829 175

In January, 1948, on the occasion of the signing of a treaty of mutual assistance with Rumania, the Bulgarian Premier, Dimitrov, risked an allusion to a project for the federation of the Balkan States, but this was immediately disavowed by the Kremlin. [185]

Dimitrov died on July 1, 1949; he was replaced as leader of the Government by Kolarov, and at the head of the Bulgarian Communist Party by his brother-in-law, Valko Tchervenkov.

The sentencing (March 8, 1949) of four Protestant pastors, accused of espionage, to life imprisonment, and the imprisonment of eleven others for a term of years, called forth vehement protests in the Christian world, and justified the sending of a diplomatic note by Great Britain, on March 12, in which these proceedings were described as a violation of Art. 2 of the peace treaty concerning 'fundamental liberties'.

The year 1949 was marked by progressive tension in the relations between Belgrade and Sofia. In September the Bulgarian Government denounced the treaty of friendship and, on October 6, the frontier agreement with Yugoslavia. This antagonism, which revived the Macedonian Question, reached a crisis at the trial of Traitcho Kostov, ex-Vice-President of the Council. Accused in March, by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, of 'flagrant errors' (the most serious accusation being that of having invoked the principle of State secrecy in order to withhold information of a commercial nature from representatives of the Soviet Union), Kostov found the charges gradually extended, until he was involved in a plot against the safety of the State, with the complicity of the Anglo-Americans and the agents of Tito. He was condemned to death, and executed on December 16. The Yugoslav press considered this charge as having been trumped up entirely with a view to compromising and discrediting Tito. 648 687 175 [208]

The municipal elections of May 15, 1949, gave the Communist-controlled Government of the 'Homeland Front' 92.1 per cent of the votes cast (370,000 blank votes); the legislative elections of December 18 raised this percentage to 666 175

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 668 575 ings, manifestations, and commemorations in America; in June 1942 such meetings and congresses took place in New York, in Pittsburgh, in Detroit, in Kansas, in Cleveland, in San Francisco, in Oakland, and also in Canada, Argentina, etc., organized by local Slavic committees. These organizations in America and in other countries represent ramifications of the Moscow center; and at each meeting they manifested this relationship by sending addresses and telegrams not only to the Panslavic committee in Moscow but to Stalin, Kalinin, Molotov, and so on. Around the Muscovite center were organized during the war all kinds of Slavic national committees and unions of patriots at the head of which one could find the members of the Panslavic committee in Moscow. These committees and unions were nuclei from which originated the "democratic governments" imposed by Russia to the Slavic and non-Slavic countries (similar committees were organized for Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria) which found themselves in the sphere of Russia's influence.

● [207] For the task of propaganda of these Panslavic ideas of union and fraternity of the Slavs under the protection of Soviet Russia and under her cultural leadership there has been established a monthly review under the title *The Slavs*, published in Moscow in Russian.

186* 829 651 It is paradoxical enough that if one takes different Soviet encyclopedias one may find a radical refutation of Panslavic conceptions; the Panslavism of the 19th century has been always qualified there as a bourgeois imperialistic doctrine. It would be very difficult, however, to find any salient difference between the Panslavistic imperialistic conceptions of Tsarist Russia, as far as their essence is concerned, and the Panslavistic policy of the Soviets, even though their motives and ultimate goals are not identical. In order to save appearances the official Soviet press still stresses that difference; so N. Leonidov in his articles *The New Phase in Slav History* published in *New Times* in Moscow in September, 1946, said: "The Russian people never identified themselves with the imperialistic chauvinistic Panslavism of the